

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.353
5 December 1967
ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

APR 10 1968

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 5 December 1967, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. EDELSTAM (Sweden)

GE-67-25576
68-01147

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A. da COSTA GUIMARAES
Mr. J. NOGUEIRA FIIHO

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV

Burma:

U KYAW MIN

Canada:

Mr. A.G. CAMPBELL
Mr. A. BERNIER

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. VAJNAR
Mr. J. STRUCKA

Ethiopia:

Mr. A. ZELIEKE

India:

Mr. V.C. TRIVEDI
Mr. N. KRISHNAN
Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. R. CARACCIOLI
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI
Mr. E. FRANCO
Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:

Mr. J. CASTANEDA
Miss E. AGUIRRE

Nigeria:

Alhaji SULE KOLO
Mr. B.O. TONWE

Poland:

Mr. A. CZARKOWSKI
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI

Romania:

Mr. O. IONESCO
Mr. C. GEORGESCO
Mr. A. COROIANU
Mr. C. MITRAN

Sweden:

Mr. A. EDELSTAM
Mr. R. BOMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
Mr. R.M. TIMERBAIEV
Mr. V.V. SHUSTOV
Mr. V.B. TOULINOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF
Mr. O. SIRRY
Mr. M. SHAKER

United Kingdom:

Mr. I.F. PORTER
Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER
Mr. S. De PALMA
Mr. C.G. BREAM
Mr. A.F. NEIDLE

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

1. The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): I declare open the 353rd plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
2. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): On Saturday 2 December President Johnson announced the intention of the United States to accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards — when such safeguards came into effect under the non-proliferation treaty — on all its nuclear activities, excluding only those having direct national security significance. President Johnson's announcement, which was made on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first sustained fission reaction, thus reaffirmed the importance the United States attaches to a successful conclusion of the treaty we are negotiating in this Conference.
3. We are all here aware of the crucial role played by safeguards in the effort to prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons. We are also aware of the difficulty of achieving a safeguards article which will be widely acceptable. From our discussions, it has become clear to us that all must be assured that safeguards will not impose industrial or economic burdens on treaty signatories or otherwise be harmful or onerous. The United States is confident that an article can be drafted and agreed which will satisfy these requirements. Our confidence that safeguards will not be burdensome is reflected in our own proposal to accept them on peaceful nuclear activities in the United States. As President Johnson made unmistakably clear on the anniversary of Enrico Fermi's great work, the United States does not expect to ask any nation to accept safeguards that we are unwilling to accept ourselves.
4. I should now like to read those portions of the President's statement which deal specifically with the non-proliferation treaty and the application of IAEA safeguards to nuclear facilities in the United States. The President said:

"By learning the secret of the atom, we have given mankind -- for the first time in history -- all the energy mankind can possibly use.

"It took the genius of countless generations of dedicated scientists to find the secret, and it remains to us to use it wisely.

"What began as the most terrible instrument of war that man has ever seen, can become the key to a golden age of mankind. But this will not happen unless we make it happen.

"We cannot forget that another, darker future also opened on this day, twenty-five years ago.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

"The power to achieve the promise of Genesis is also power to fulfil the prophecy of Armageddon. We can either remake life on earth or we can end it for ever.

"Let me be specific.

"If Enrico Fermi's reactor had operated ten thousand years, it would not have produced enough plutonium for one atomic bomb.

"Today, a single reactor can, while generating electricity, produce enough plutonium to make dozens of bombs every year. And scores of these reactors are now being built all over the world.

"Their purpose is peaceful. Yet the fact remains that the secret diversion of even a small part of the plutonium they create could soon give every nation power to destroy civilization -- if not life on this earth.

"We cannot permit this to happen.

"Nor can mankind be denied the unlimited benefits of the peaceful atom.

"We must find a way to remove the threat while preserving the promise.

"The American people made their own desires crystal clear when their representatives in the United States Senate voted unanimously to support an effective non-proliferation treaty for nuclear weapons.

"We are now engaged in a major effort to achieve such a treaty, in a form acceptable to all nations.

"We are trying to assure that the peaceful benefits of the atom will be shared by all mankind -- without increasing the threat of nuclear destruction.

"We do not believe that the safeguards we propose in that treaty will interfere with the peaceful activities of any country.

"And I want to make it clear to the world that we in the United States are not asking any country to accept safeguards that we are unwilling to accept ourselves.

"So I am, today, announcing that when such safeguards are applied under the treaty, the United States will permit the International Atomic Energy Agency to apply its safeguards to all nuclear activities in the United States -- excluding only those with direct national security significance.

"Under this offer the Agency will be able to inspect a broad range of United States nuclear activities, both governmental and private, including the fuel in nuclear power reactors owned by utilities for generating electricity, and the fabrication and chemical reprocessing of such fuel.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

"This pledge maintains the consistent policy of the United States since the beginning of the nuclear age.

"Just fourteen years ago, a President of the United States appeared before the General Assembly of the United Nations to urge the peaceful use of the atom. President Eisenhower said on that occasion:

"... The United States pledges ... before the world ... its determination to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma -- to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.^{1/}

"We renew that pledge today. We reaffirm our determination to dedicate the miraculous power of the atom, not to death, but to life.

"We invite the world's nations to join with us.

"Let us use then this historic anniversary to deepen and reaffirm the search for peace.

"Let us so conduct ourselves that future generations will look back upon December 2, 1942 -- not as the origin of sorrow and despair -- but as the beginning of the brightest, most inspiring chapter in the long history of man."
5. I would like to request that the text of President Johnson's address be made available and circulated as a Conference document of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament^{2/}.

6. Mr. PORTER (United Kingdom): We have just heard a statement of great interest from the representative of the United States. Her Majesty's Government has been giving careful thought to the application of international safeguards in the United Kingdom, and I am happy to be able to inform the Committee of an announcement made by the British Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Mulley, in the House of Commons yesterday. Mr. Mulley said:

"As the House will know, a key issue in the negotiations at present taking place in Geneva to secure a non-proliferation treaty has been the safeguards to be applied in order to ensure that there is no diversion by the non-nuclear-weapon signatories of the treaty of materials from their civil nuclear programmes to nuclear weapon purposes.

1/ See Official Records of the General Assembly. Eighth session. Plenary Meetings, 470th plenary meeting, para.125; p.452.

2/ Circulated as document ENDC/206.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

"In order to assist these negotiations Her Majesty's Government have decided that, at such time as international safeguards are put into effect in the non-nuclear-weapon States in implementation of the provisions of a treaty, they will be prepared to offer an opportunity for the application of similar safeguards in the United Kingdom subject to exclusions for national security reasons only. Her Majesty's Government welcome the similar decision announced by President Johnson on behalf of the United States."

That is the end of Mr. Mulley's statement. I should be grateful if the text could be circulated as a Conference document^{3/}.

7. Mr. da COSTA GUIMARAES (Brazil): Let my first words be to welcome President Johnson's statement of 2 December and to congratulate Mr. Foster on bringing it before our Committee. The same welcome is extended by my delegation to the similar declaration made by Mr. Mulley, Minister of State, on behalf of the United Kingdom.

8. On this occasion I wish also to congratulate our co-Chairmen upon their effort in circulating a draft interim report (1 December) twenty-four hours after they stated their position on it. In the view of my delegation, such an effort not only deserves our recognition but also requires us in this Committee to adopt a constructive attitude in considering the draft.

9. The Brazilian delegation is prepared to accept the principle stemming from the draft report that in the present circumstances, when negotiations are far from exhausted, the best way to speed the interim report to the General Assembly is not to include comments by the Committee on the work we have done here since February. In reporting in that factual way we should be following the same line as in our previous -- equally interim -- reports to the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission. That, however, does not imply that we should not give the General Assembly specific evidence of the work still going on. If it is not possible to send to the General Assembly a complete negotiated draft treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the best course to adopt now, the Brazilian delegation believes, is to provide the Assembly with as complete as possible a picture of the various proposals which have been submitted, as was recently suggested by the representative of Italy, Mr. Caracciolo (ENDC/PV.350, para.15). That is the picture the Brazilian delegation had in mind when, on 16 November, Mr. Azeredo da Silveira supported the idea of an interim report.

3/ Circulated as document ENDC/207.

(Mr. da Costa Guimaraes, Brazil)

10. In doing so we should be conforming to the previous practice of the Eighteen-Nation Committee -- and in our view this is hardly the time to argue about its convenience -- to submit interim reports which, besides being factual, serve to introduce the verbatim records of our meetings and the documents circulated in the Conference. On the other hand, that procedure would permit us to deal with the item concerning a non-proliferation treaty in an acceptable way and would cover the assertion, included in the draft report, that the Committee had held a valuable discussion on the item concerning the "Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests", testifying to the importance of the contributions made by several delegations on that matter.

11. I must emphasize that the Brazilian delegation is not advocating that we should take as a model what was, I believe, the first interim report in the history of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, and which, with the permission of the Committee, I shall now read:

"INTERIM REPORT

"As an interim report, the Sub-Committee submits herewith to the full Committee the records of its meetings thus far. The Sub-Committee regrets that it is not possible to report progress towards a treaty for the discontinuance of nuclear weapon tests." (ENDC/10)

That interim report was circulated on 22 March 1962.

12. In the spirit of collaboration that I mentioned before, the Brazilian delegation wishes to submit a proposal to add to the draft interim report a paragraph numbered 7 which, repeating the very words of our 1966 report (ENDC/184, p.5), which was also inconclusive, would read as follows:

"7. Transmitted as Annex II to this interim report is a list of all documents submitted to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and verbatim records of the plenary meetings. Annex I contains the text of attached documents."

13. In putting forward that suggestion, the Brazilian delegation believes that it will not meet with any strong objection, for we are convinced that it takes account of the interests of the Committee. To add to our report, in accordance with past practice, the verbatim records of the meetings held and the Conference documents

(Mr. da Costa Guimaraes, Brazil)

circulated -- which are already available at United Nations Headquarters -- would only facilitate the work of delegations in the General Assembly and ensure a spirit of good will in making possible a correct appreciation of our work. We are equally convinced that it will not be argued that that procedure might harm the successful negotiation of our treaty. The words of one of our most recent speakers, Alhaji Sule Kolo, the representative of Nigeria, are still resounding in this room: the fact that the negotiations are complicated should not lead us to shirk our responsibilities but, on the contrary, should lead us to "increase our efforts so that out of the complication of negotiations should emerge equitable and lasting solutions" (ENDC/PV.351, para.5).

14. If my suggestion for adding a new paragraph with the same old words provokes, for other relevant reasons of which I am unaware, to be unacceptable, the Brazilian delegation requests formally to be allowed to use its right to have its position stated in an addendum to the report. The use of such right should not raise any objection, since that right has already been recognized by the Eighteen-Nation Committee. The report of 7 December 1962 had as Addendum 1 the provisional verbatim records and, attached as Addendum 2,

"At the request of certain delegations, summaries of their positions, as they themselves have prepared them without any comment thereon by the Committee ..." (ENDC/68, p.2).

15. Moreover, the right was recognized to one particular delegation to have its position stated in an addendum to Addendum 1.

16. The Brazilian delegation is convinced that, by making it possible for the world community, in the forum of the General Assembly, to take note of the progress of our work, we shall be providing a larger and sounder basis for that work. Furthermore, we have no doubt that in doing so we shall be facilitating the achievement of our common objective: the early conclusion of a practical and equitable treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, a treaty which, as all of us in this Committee in good faith wish, will satisfy the aspirations and interests of all countries.

17. Mr. CARACCIOLO (Italy): I wish to make only a very brief statement. First of all, echoing the words spoken on radio and television by President Saragat, I want to welcome the statements made by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom. I think that the speech by President Johnson is a great contribution to peace, and if it is followed by similar declarations by other nuclear Powers it will prove to be a great step towards the conclusion of our work.

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

18. I should also like to join the Brazilian delegation in expressing my thanks to the co-Chairmen for providing us with the text of an interim report (1 December), which we have studied very carefully. In that connexion I should like to make two remarks. One, of a more substantial character, reflects our concern that such a condensed interim report may carry the impression that our Committee has so far achieved only very modest results and that the difficulties ahead of us are greater than they really are. Furthermore, we fear that such a report will be interpreted by the General Assembly as an endeavour to avoid providing that body with sufficient material for even a partial appreciation of our activity.

19. Therefore, our opinion is that this report would better fulfil its purpose by informing the General Assembly more specifically about our work, either by including the texts of the various documents that have been issued during the session, as just suggested by the representative of Brazil, or by including a short account of the different positions that have arisen in the course of our work. This suggestion does not seem to me to be inconsistent with what is stated at the end of paragraph 4 of the draft report, where the nature of the document is defined as being that of an "interim status report".

20. Another point that I should like to raise is of a more formal character, but we attach particular importance to it because it is the logical consequence of what I have already said. Paragraph 1 of the draft before us states: "The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament transmits ...". That is a proper expression which undoubtedly corresponds with the reality of the situation. Therefore, in order to be consistent with what is stated in paragraph 1, we propose that in the last paragraph the word "submitted" be changed to what we consider to be a more proper one, that is, "transmitted". I am aware that in previous years the word "submitted" has been used; nevertheless the Italian delegation feels that the suggested modification would express more clearly our actual common responsibility.

21. The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): We have now entered upon a discussion of the paper submitted to the Committee as a recommendation by the co-Chairmen: the draft interim report to the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We have heard statements on the draft interim report by the representatives of Brazil and Italy, who have made some specific suggestions. Does any other representative wish to make some comments on the draft report or on the statements we have just heard concerning it?

22. Mr. TRIVEDI (India): At the outset I should like to join the representatives of Brazil and Italy in congratulating the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom upon their statements this morning and also to welcome President Johnson's statement of 2 December and the statement made on 4 December by the Minister of State of the United Kingdom, Mr. Mulley.

23. The Indian delegation welcomes those statements for two specific reasons. First, those announcements demonstrate in a practical manner that the old contention that there are some intrinsic difficulties in applying safeguards to the production of fissionable material in nuclear-weapon countries is not really valid. The second reason for my welcoming those announcements is that they point to the right direction for the solution of the difficulties we are facing in successfully negotiating a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. They are a step in the right direction because, as the Indian delegation has maintained, an adequate control article following an adequate substantive article in the treaty should provide for safeguards on the production of fissile material for weapon purposes in all countries. For those two reasons, therefore, I welcome those announcements: first, because they demonstrate that it can be done, and secondly, because they point to the right solution and indicate a step in the right direction.

24. Turning to the draft interim report (1 December), I also join the representative of Brazil in congratulating the co-Chairmen on their very prompt action in letting us have a draft report. I have comments of two categories to make on this draft. My comments in the first category are mainly of a verbal nature, with the idea of ensuring that the draft is not misunderstood and that it correctly expresses the true position. The second category of my comments relates to the point raised by the representative of Brazil.

25. As far as the first category of comments is concerned, I would first refer to paragraph 4 of the draft report, which speaks of expediting "the completion of a draft non-proliferation treaty". That is not a very happy phrase: "completion of a draft non-proliferation treaty". It brings in nuances concerning the completeness or incompleteness of a draft which in any case are not particularly desirable at the present stage in an interim report. I think it would be better to follow the formula adopted by the United Nations General Assembly itself. In resolution 2028 (XX) the General Assembly uses the following words:

"Requests the Eighteen-Nation Committee to submit to the General Assembly at an early date a report on the results of its work on a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons." (ENDC/161)

(Mr. Trivedi, India)

The same phrase is used in resolution 2153A (XXI) (ENDC/185). I think it would be advisable and more appropriate, and in fact more correct, to use the phrase adopted in those United Nations resolutions. Therefore I think we ought to say: "in order to expedite its work on a draft non-proliferation treaty", rather than "in order to expedite the completion of a draft non-proliferation treaty". That would be in consonance with the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly.

26. I have some comments on paragraph 5 of the draft also, but before coming to that paragraph I should like to make some similar comments on paragraph 6, which says: "Since the Committee is continuing its work with a view to completing a draft Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". I think that here also we should use some other word, and I think it would be more appropriate to say: "negotiating a draft Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". That is what the resolutions have asked us to do, and that is what we are doing.

27. The draft report then says: "it is unable at this time to provide a report ...". I think we should say "a final report", because this is an interim status report. We should say: "... to provide a final report on this question for the consideration of the United Nations General Assembly or the United Nations Disarmament Commission."

28. I also support the suggestion made by the representative of Italy in regard to changing the word "submitted" to "transmitted".

29. Now I turn to paragraph 5 of the draft report. In the first sentence, on the second line, it states: "... the Committee has undertaken an intensive consideration of a draft Treaty ...". With due apologies to English-speaking representatives here, I think the word "an" should be omitted. Apart from grammatical reasons, I think my suggestion is an important one. I shall have something more to say about the next sentence, but, while I am on verbal changes, I note that the word "complete" appears in the next sentence: "Substantial progress has been made, although a complete draft has not as yet been achieved." Even an incomplete draft has not been achieved. I think "final" would be a better word, and it would then read: "although a final draft has not yet been achieved".

30. Those are the verbal changes that I wish to commend to the consideration of the co-Chairmen and the Committee.

(Mr. Trivedi, India)

31. I shall now come to the second category of my comments -- the point so ably raised by the representative of Brazil. We have been submitting reports, as he said, since 1962, and they have all been interim reports. This report is therefore no different from any other report.

32. Secondly, the General Assembly has asked us to give it at an early date a report on the results of our work on a treaty. In line with what we have done, therefore, it is appropriate that we should inform it of the results of our work so far, that we should tell it what has been done so far, because the fact remains that substantial progress has been made.

33. There is another point which I should like to mention in this connexion. Many of us were present at the last session of the General Assembly. A representative in the First Committee complained that insufficient work was being done by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. Although the report did mention that matters were discussed at length and so on, he stated somewhat eloquently that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament was not doing its work properly. He made some other comments also. He referred to the Committee members as being in the antechamber of the nuclear sanctum sanctorum; he talked about the people who belonged to the élite, and so on. We should try to avoid giving grounds for such comments.

34. However, apart from that, as we have said before and as the representative of the USSR has said before, we have nothing to be ashamed of in the work done so far, and I think it is appropriate that we should say, if not in detail, at least as suggested by the representative of Brazil, what has been done. Therefore I fully agree with him that a paragraph 7 should be added as suggested by him. I think it is appropriate to add something to paragraph 5 too, and I suggest the following for your consideration. The first sentence, minus the word "an", could remain as it is: "... has undertaken intensive consideration of a draft Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons." Then I think we should say something such as the following:

"Representatives participating in the work of the Committee have made valuable contributions towards the achievement of a treaty which is acceptable to all concerned and satisfactory to the international community. Several delegations also submitted working papers towards that objective. The Committee has already made substantial progress, although a final draft has not yet been achieved."

(Mr. Trivedi, India)

35. As you will notice, the phrase I have used about the achievement of a treaty is taken from the draft resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. It is worth mentioning here that the draft given to us by the co-Chairmen very rightly speaks of the valuable discussion on the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and, very rightly also, speaks about the fact that several delegations made important contributions in that discussion. That is quite proper. We did do so, but we did more of the same thing on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

36. For the time being those are my comments and suggestions. I shall take the liberty of asking for the floor again, if need be.

37. The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): Does any other representative wish to make a general comment on the draft report before us? When we have had all the comments of a more general nature on the draft, we might have a discussion on it paragraph by paragraph and see whether we can achieve a final text today, because I think we all have a real sense of urgency in this matter. The General Assembly and its First Committee are in fact waiting for some word from us, and I think it would be very desirable to finalize the report today.

38. Mr. da COSTA GUIMARAES (Brazil): I should like to state that the Brazilian delegation has given close attention to the statements that the representatives of Italy and India have just made. In our opinion, the points they have raised deserve consideration by our Committee. The Brazilian delegation would like to support particularly the idea that the draft report should not give the impression that negotiations on all articles of the draft treaty other than article III have been exhausted, for that is a feeling which the Brazilian delegation could not share.

39. The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): If no other representative wishes to take the floor now, I suggest that we try to go through the draft report paragraph by paragraph to see whether we can agree on the wording and, if possible, adopt it as the final report today.

40. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I think it is difficult at the present time to go into all the detailed aspects of the considerations put forward by the representatives of Brazil, Italy and India. Some of the questions, I should say, concern purely linguistic details of construction, relating to English and little or not at all to other languages. In the light of that fact we certainly think that it would be inexpedient to examine here and now the wording of each paragraph, since that would create certain difficulties for some delegations, especially for the delegations that are not English-speaking.

41. I think it would be appropriate for the co-Chairmen to examine all the considerations put forward by the three delegations and submit them in accordance with existing precedents, or submit a new version, or submit appropriate reasons in defence of the position and wordings which have been put forward hitherto. In a preliminary way -- as you yourselves realize, I have not had an opportunity to exchange views with the United States co-Chairman, Mr. Foster -- we should merely like to point out that the submission of the complete text of all the amendments for the consideration of the General Assembly does not appear to us to be expedient. It would not give a picture of what is actually taking place in regard to the preparation of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It might create to some extent a wrong and inaccurate picture of the situation existing at the present time in solving the problem which has been entrusted to the Committee for urgent consideration.

42. In the present situation of the matter of non-proliferation, the most appropriate course would be to point out to the General Assembly that the Committee has not been able to achieve and submit a final -- as the representative of India, Mr. Trivedi, has said -- or complete text of the treaty, in as much as the consideration of questions of control and of those relating to other articles has not been completed.

43. As a matter of fact, in assessing the present situation of the consideration of the non-proliferation problem, the question of appropriateness must be taken as the starting-point. Would it contribute to the fulfilment of the task entrusted to the Committee if it now submitted a virtually complete report, on which, as we understand, the representative of Brazil insists -- that is, if it submitted the usual complete report together with a full list of all documents, all verbatim reports and so on? Would that contribute to the fulfilment of the fundamental task on which we are now working, or not? That is the question before us.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

44. Our delegation is convinced that it would not; because, I repeat once again, it would create an inaccurate and wrong picture and, I would say, one which does not correspond to the actual situation in which we find ourselves at present. It would involve other bodies in the examination of the question which is at present under consideration by ourselves. This question, after the receipt of our report, will have to be considered in other bodies, which will get a not altogether accurate idea of what is taking place; and therefore it would seem to us that the conditions for the submission of a de facto -- and I emphasize de facto -- complete report at the present time have not been created; the submission of such a report would only complicate and render more difficult the subsequent solution of the problem on which we are working here. Of course, as is stressed in our draft report, it is pointed out that such a report will be submitted as soon as we have finished our work for the accomplishment of the task which has been set before the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

45. Those are our preliminary observations. We may not have been able to go into and discuss all the details and specific aspects of each of the proposals which have been put forward here; including editorial, stylistic and logical amendments; but we think it would be appropriate to request the co-Chairmen to examine and discuss all the views that have been put forward and to submit at our next meeting their own views or, if necessary a new version of the report.

46. Those are the preliminary observations of the Soviet delegation on the statements and views put forward by the representatives of Brazil, Italy and India.

47. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): In general we agree with many of the observations and concerns which have been expressed by my co-Chairman, Mr. Roshchin, the representative of the USSR. However, perhaps I might make some preliminary comments on specific points, without, of course, having had an opportunity of discussing them with him. I agree with him that it would be more constructive for us to meet again, instead of going through a detailed line-by-line discussion, in view of the difficulties of language and other problems. However, in a preliminary way I should like at least to touch upon certain substantive difficulties which appear to me to be important.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

48. The United States hopes that the Committee will be prepared to adopt an interim report to the General Assembly. We do not believe that it should be accompanied by all the documents relating to the draft non-proliferation treaty which are now before the Committee. The essence of the report is that we are still at work on the draft treaty, as Mr. Trivedi has said, but are not yet in a position to submit a substantive report to the General Assembly on that treaty. That is why we did not include an incomplete draft of the treaty in the draft report recommended to the Conference by the co-Chairmen. We think it would be quite misleading to include other documents containing suggested amendments to the incomplete draft treaty or other suggestions relating to the non-proliferation question. We do not see any valid basis for sending that undigested, incomplete and not fully considered list of documents, no matter how useful the documents may ultimately be.

49. Of course, those Members of the United Nations that are not represented here are entitled to a full report on our work when the work has been concluded. We have made it quite clear in the draft report submitted to the Committee that we intend to propose such a report when the matter has reached that stage. At that time it will be much more helpful and constructive to include all the working papers and material that have been considered in the course of our deliberations, but it would hardly help the General Assembly if we did so at this stage. We do not have any real consensus of the Committee on those particular papers at this time.

50. In regard to the request made by the representative of Brazil, I think there is nothing to prevent any delegation from submitting whatever it wants to submit to the General Assembly. It is its right, and it is perfectly proper that the delegation should exercise it; but to include this group of suggestions, many of which are constructive, without any indication of how they fit into the broad picture, would not be helpful at this time.

51. I would now refer to the suggestion made by the representative of India regarding a phrase in paragraph 4 of the draft report. I must say I see no difficulty in using the words now included. I think they state precisely what the United States delegation, at least, has been attempting to achieve in our discussions here: to expedite the completion of a draft non-proliferation treaty. That has been stated not only by the United States delegation but also by many other delegations, and it is clearly what our objective has been.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

52. Of course, we shall study the suggestions made by the representative of India in favour of a "final" rather than a "complete" draft treaty, in paragraph 5, but at first glance it appears to raise other difficulties, not only of language. I think we should consider that change very carefully, and we shall.

53. We also want to consider the suggestion made by the representative of India for a new paragraph 7. That would seem to us, at least at first glance, to enter into an area of substance, which may not be useful at this time and would seem to be somewhat inconsistent with the characterization of the report as an "interim" report; but, again, we shall be happy to study it, and perhaps we shall be able to give a more considered response later.

54. The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): The Committee has before it a proposal by the co-Chairmen that they should study the suggestions for changes and additions to the draft report and submit a new draft to the Committee.

55. Mr. TRIVEDI (India): I should like to refer to some of the comments made by the representative of the United States. To say that the word "completion" in paragraph 4 is appropriate, on the one hand, and then to say that no other working papers should be included --- it seems to the Indian delegation that those statements are at variance with each other. When one says that something has to be completed, it means that there is something incomplete there, but that is not what has been accepted by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

56. Suggestions have been made for amending the preamble or one or other of the articles. Nothing is even incomplete at the moment. There is no incomplete treaty to be completed. So what I have suggested is to use a better phrase, a less controversial phrase, a phrase taken from the resolution of the General Assembly, and I do not see what objection there could be to accepting the phrase, "to expedite its work on a non-proliferation treaty", because that is what we are doing, and in another place to changing the word "completing" to "negotiating", which is our function. My suggestion is to use less controversial phrases rather than controversial ones.

(Mr. Trivedi, India)

57. It is not so much a question of whether or not we are completing a draft non-proliferation treaty. After all, when you come to think of it as a draft, there is a complete treaty, with an article III provided by the delegation of Sweden. Therefore, the question of completing something, or having something incomplete, does not arise. It is a question of negotiating a draft treaty. In order to avoid any such nuances, any thinking at variance, my delegation had suggested phrases which would be acceptable to all concerned, phrases which would be non-controversial. That is why we suggested the words "its work" in paragraph 4 and "final" instead of "complete" in paragraph 5. If the co-Chairmen feel that some other word is necessary, we have no objection, but "complete" is a word we should like to avoid. The same remark applies to paragraph 6. The representative of the United States did not mention that, but here again we would change the word "completing" to "negotiating" so that it would read "negotiating a draft Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

58. Mr. CARACCIOL (Italy): I listened with great attention to the preliminary remarks made by the two co-Chairmen and I took note of their preliminary opinion that to encumber the report with many texts might not clarify the actual work already done here; but I should like to remind the Committee of the two main points that we made. Though we thought the Brazilian suggestion was a satisfactory one, we did not insist on a specific way of informing the General Assembly about our work, but we thought that some way should be found so that a short account of our position could be given to the General Assembly. That could of course be done in several different ways, and I am sure that the co-Chairmen will find a way of satisfying not only the request made by the Italian delegation but what seems to be the desire of many countries that are not represented here.

59. I should also like to revert to the other point I made. The central idea is to make it clear that this is a report made by the Committee and that we all share the responsibility of presenting it to the United Nations.

60. Mr. CAMPBELL (Canada): First of all I should like to say that the Canadian delegation welcomes the proposals for the circulation as Conference documents of the very important statements by the President of the United States and the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom.

(Mr. Campbell, Canada)

61. With regard to the draft report, the Canadian authorities' concept of the kind of report which the Committee might send to the General Assembly does not differ in any material way from the draft circulated by the co-Chairmen (1 December). As was indicated by the leader of the Canadian delegation at our informal discussion on 16 November, we doubt that it would be assisting the General Assembly if we were to present to it in detail the results of our discussions as they stand now. I do not want to embark on an exegesis of General Assembly resolutions, but in considering this matter we had in mind resolution 2162C (XXI) (ENDC/185), which instructed us to report "as appropriate" to the General Assembly on the progress achieved. That phrase "as appropriate" in our view raises not only questions of timing and frequency but also the question of the nature of any particular report. Past practices, to which the representative of Brazil has referred, are therefore regarded by us as a useful guide; but present circumstances, in our view, should be the main consideration.

62. The Canadian delegation was favourably impressed by the suggestions made at our informal meeting on 16 November by the representative of Mexico. As we understood it, his solution was a short interim report describing the Committee's progress on the non-proliferation treaty and asking the General Assembly for further time to conclude our discussions here. That, as we understood it, would be done with a view to avoiding a debate at this time on the substance of the non-proliferation treaty in the General Assembly. That appears to be very much what the co-Chairmen have now suggested, and that approach meets the judgement of the Canadian delegation.

63. In the circumstances I should not have asked for the floor today if a number of other delegations had not already commented on both the over-all aspects and the details of the draft report. However, since several comments have been made, the Canadian delegation considers it appropriate to state that it shares the view that we are unlikely to assist the General Assembly, especially at this late stage in its session, by presenting it with a collection of documents which do not yet lead to conclusions. Rather, in the view of the Canadian authorities, it would be preferable, if the co-Chairmen were able to agree without difficulty on a suitable formulation, to incorporate in their draft, perhaps in paragraph 5, along the general lines suggested by the representative of India, some general indication of favourable progress in the non-proliferation treaty negotiations and a forecast for the future.

64. The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): I wish to repeat what I said earlier: that the co-Chairmen have offered to look into the suggestions concerning verbal changes and amendments that have been submitted by various delegations here this morning and to present to us as soon as possible a new draft of an interim report. I would refer to what I said earlier about the urgency of this matter. We have to recognize that the General Assembly and the First Committee are waiting for something from us, and therefore it would be very helpful if we could have the new proposals from the co-Chairmen in time to enable us to have a discussion on this matter again at our next meeting.

65. Alhaji SULE KOLO (Nigeria): I feel I should point out that, as was quite rightly said earlier, time is not on our side. Actually the purpose of this present exercise is to ensure that some form of report be sent as quickly as possible to the General Assembly while we continue our work here. We have no more than two weeks at the most and we meet only twice a week. In other words, we have only about four more meetings. If we should take one week, that is two meetings, discussing what form of report we should send, I am afraid the object of our staying on here would be defeated.

66. On the other hand, when you, Mr. Chairman, called for speakers I think you used the words "general comments" and asked if any representative had remarks of a general nature to make. We refrained from making any remarks because, in the first place, we agreed to a certain extent with what was said by previous speakers, particularly our friends from Brazil and India, and we thought there was no need to make a general statement. However, if the decision is that there will be a reconsideration of the draft on the basis of what has been said, I think other representatives may want to make minor amendments or suggestions on certain details, and unless we deal with all of those we shall find ourselves repeating what has happened today and asking for a further postponement and thus wasting time.

67. First of all, I should like to know whether the co-Chairmen can inform us how soon they will be able to let us have a revised draft. I would suggest that we might even meet on an afternoon or on a Wednesday to ensure that the objective is achieved.

68. The second point I should like to make is that there are certain rights which representatives have here, and the representative from Brazil mentioned that he would like to have at least a statement of his position included in the report. It seems

(Alhaji Sule Kolo, Nigeria)

to me that if a number of representatives take the same attitude we shall have a report which is not a report of progress but a report of disagreement. Since the amendments suggested would not represent a departure from what has been the usual practice, I think a heavy responsibility rests on the co-Chairmen to say why they think it is very important in this case that we depart from the normal procedure.

69. I should like to point out here that very little is secret about what we are doing at the moment. The draft submitted by the two co-Chairmen is a public paper, and I read in the newspapers the various proposals put forward by delegations here and by others outside. So in fact it would be doing justice to our case and setting the situation right if we continued the usual practice. Otherwise there would be misleading articles and statements about what the position is.

70. The alternative proposed by the representative of Italy appears to be an attractive compromise, but I fear that it might lead us into a good deal of difficulty. Each delegation might point out that perhaps the correct emphasis had not been placed on certain statements, that its words were not adequately reflected in the report, and so on.

71. To sum up, it seems to me that the simplest solution would be to adopt the proposal submitted by Brazil, which I think was supported with certain amendments with regard to the co-Chairmen's draft by the representative of India.

72. The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): I wish to assure the representative of Nigeria that of course it was not my intention to prevent anybody from making any statements on the draft report. I only thought, as I said, that we should have some general comments from representatives first and then we should go through the report paragraph by paragraph, but that suggestion was not accepted by all delegations. Therefore we continued the general debate, as it were. The statement by the representative of Nigeria came, very properly, before we adjourned.

73. I wish to ask whether any other representative would like to take the floor at this time. If not, I think we shall have to adopt the procedure that has been suggested: that the co-Chairmen look carefully, as they have promised, into the various suggestions that have been made and present to us at their earliest convenience a new draft report. It is understandable that they might find it difficult to indicate to us the exact timing of such submission. I do not know whether we should

(The Chairman, Sweden)

press them on that point but I think they recognize as well as the rest of us the urgency of the matter and the lack of time at our disposal.

74. I do not wish to make any suggestion that we meet at a time other than the usual one: that is to say in two days from now. Not only do we have to give some time to the co-Chairmen to examine the matter and to submit a new draft, but we as delegations, I think, also will need some time to look at the new draft and submit it to our capitals. Personally I feel that an interval of two days may be necessary in order that we may have a useful discussion of this subject again at our next meeting. Therefore, unless there is some strong objection, I think we should follow, for the present at least, our usual procedure and hold our next meeting on Thursday -- that is to say in two days' time.

The Conference decided to issue the following communique:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 353rd plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. A. Edelstam, representative of Sweden.

"Statements were made by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Brazil, Italy, India, the USSR, Canada and Nigeria.

"The following documents were tabled:

Statement of President Lyndon B. Johnson dated 2 December 1967 (ENDC/206);

Statement made by the British Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, the Right Honourable F. Mulley, in the House of Commons on 4 December 1967 (ENDC/207).

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 7 December 1967, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

